```
1 | LOUIS A. HIGHMAN, State Bar No. 61703
     BRUCE J. HIGHMAN, State Bar No. 101760
    |HIGHMAN, HIGHMAN & BALL
    A Professional Law Association
    870 Market Street, Suite 467
    San Francisco, CA 94102
    Telephone:
                (415) 982-5563
    Facsimile: (415) 982-5202
  5
    Attorneys for Plaintiff MARSHA GINSBURG
  6
  7
 8
 9
                    In the United States District Court
10
              In and for the Northern District of California
11
12
13
    MARSHA GINSBURG,
                                        No. 08-03031 JSW
14
               Plaintiff,
                                         APPLICATION REQUESTING
                                         MODIFICATION OF BRIEFING
15
                                         SCHEDULE ALLOWING
                                         PLAINTIFF TO FILE
16
                                         OPPOSITION TO MOTION
    HEARST COMMUNICATIONS, INC.;
                                         TO DISMISS BY SEPTEMBER
17
    HEARST CORPORATION; HEARST
                                        12, 2008; STIPULATION;
    NEWSPAPERS,
                                        [PROPOSED] ORDER
18
                                         Local Rule 7-11
19
              Defendants.
                                         Hearing Date: 10-3-2008
20
                                         Time: 9:00 a.m.
                                         Judge: Hon. Jeffrey S.
21
                                         White
                                         Courtroom: 2
22
                                         Complaint Filed: 6-20-2008
23
24
         Louis A. Highman declares as follows:
25
         I am the lead attorney of record for plaintiff Marsha
26
    Ginsburg in the above-entitled matter.
27
28
                                   1
```

I received electronically defendants' motion to dismiss pursuant to FRCP 41(b), or in the alternative, for a more definite statement pursuant to FRCP 12(e) on August 15, 2008, and since the hearing date was October 3, 2008, it was calendared on our master calendar so that the opposition was due on September 12, 2008. Kevin Mendez, our legal assistant, was in charge of the above procedure, and it was followed in connection with the August 15, 2008 motion.

The procedure in our office is that our legal assistant, Kevin Mendez, receives the electronic orders in cases, and forwards them to the lead attorney working on the case.

I was unaware there had been an order setting briefing schedule ordered by the Court on August 18, 2008, under which plaintiff's time to respond to the motion to dismiss was changed by the Court to August 29, 2008 from the September 12, 2008 which applied previously, until I received Defendants' Notice of Unopposed Motion to Dismiss dated September 5, 2008, which was printed out and given to me by my legal assistant, Mr. Mendez, on September 8, 2008.

Defendants' Notice of Unopposed Motion to Dismiss dated September 5, 2008 indicated that since my brief was due on August 29, 2008 (which I had not known previously), that I was now late, and requested based thereon that the motion to dismiss should be granted.

I immediately spoke to Mr. Mendez to figure out what had happened since he had put down in the master calendar that

plaintiff's opposition to the motion was due on September 12, 2008, which date of September 12, 2008 was the normal date under the local rules on which the opposition would be due unless there would be some order by the Court to the contrary. As indicated above, I had been unaware of the August 18, 2008 order which had changed the due date of September 12, 2008 to August 29, 2008, and the change had not been put down on our master calendar or otherwise communicated to me.

After receiving Defendants' Notice of Unopposed Motion to Dismiss, Mr. Mendez and I went into the Pacer site, and realized that the notice of the order changing the briefing schedule had been sent to our office electronically on August 18, 2008 (the date the order was made), but for some reason Mr. Mendez had not printed out and given me a copy of that order, or e-mailed me that order, or otherwise notified me of that order; nor did he recall seeing the order previously. I was out of town from August 18, 2008 until early morning, August 21, 2008, and continued to operate under the assumption when I came back that the due date for my opposition was September 12, 2008.

I apologize for our inadvertence on this matter. Our office wishes to oppose this motion to dismiss/motion for more definite statement, and accordingly I wish to respectfully request that I be allowed to file an opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to FRCP 41(b), Or

in the Alternative, for a More Definite Statement Pursuant to FRCP 12(e) on behalf of plaintiff on or before September 12, 2008 (which was the date I continued to understand was the date on which the opposition would be due because of the inadvertence in not downloading the August 18, 2008 order which changed the original scheduling, but remained unbeknownst to me at the time), and that defendants' reply brief be filed on or before September 19, 2008, and that the hearing date for the motion remain the same (October 3, 2008).

I spoke to Mr. Lindbergh Porter, Esq., attorney for defendants on the telephone today, and he indicated he did not oppose the aforesaid extension of briefing schedule dates.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct, and was executed at San Francisco, California on September 8, 2008.

/s/Louis A. Highman Louis A. Highman, Declarant

STIPULATION RE BRIEFING SCHEDULE

It is hereby stipulated by the parties to the aboveentitled matter, that plaintiff Marsha Ginsburg be allowed to
file an opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Pursuant
to FRCP 41(b), Or in the Alternative, for a More Definite
Statement Pursuant to FRCP 12(e) on or before September 12,
2008, and that defendants' reply brief be filed on or before
September 19, 2008, and that the hearing date remain the same

1	(October 3, 2008).
2	DATED: September 8, 2008.
3	LOUIS A. HIGHMAN HIGHMAN, HIGHMAN & BALL
4	By /s/Louis A. Highman
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff MARSHA GINSBURG
6	DATED: September 8, 2008.
7	LINDBERGH PORTER LITTLER MENDELSON
8	By <u>/s/Lindbergh Porter</u> Attorneys for Defendants
9	THE HEARST CORPORATION and HEARST
10	COMMUNICATIONS, INC. dba HEARST NEWSPAPERS
11	[PROPOSED] ORDER
12	GOOD CAUSE APPEARING THEREFOR, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that
13	plaintiff Marsha Ginsburg be allowed to file an opposition to
14	Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to FRCP 41(b), Or in
15	the Alternative, for a More Definite Statement Pursuant to
16	FRCP 12(e) on or before September 12, 2008, and that
17	defendants' reply brief be filed on or before September 19,
18	2008, and that the hearing date for the motion remain the
19	same (October 3, 2008).
20	DATED: September 8, 2008.
21	HAN. HEFELY S. WHITE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE
22	The Court's Order to Show Cause, issued this date, is DISCHARGED. Counsel is
23	admonished that any future failures to comply with briefing orders issued by this Court
24	may result in sanctions being imposed. The Court already has continued the hearing from October 3, 2008 to October 17, 2008, and the hearing shall remain on calendar on
25	October 17, 2008, and the parties shall file their opposition and reply briefs in accordance with the deadlines set forth above.
26	with the deathlies set forth above.
27	
28	5